Everyday, I am working hard. I will recover and will return, and we will work together again, for Arizona and for all Americans.

Sincerely,

GABRIELLE GIFFORDS,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

JANUARY 25, 2012.

Hon. JANICE K. BREWER,
Arizona Governor, Executive Tower, West Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ.

DEAR GOVERNOR BREWER: In 2001, strongly holding the belief that there is no higher calling than serving my country, I went from selling tires in my Tucson family business to being a freshman representative in the Arizona State House. And for 10 years I served—in the Arizona legislature, in the United States Congress, and, after marrying Mark, as a proud military spouse. Always I fought for what I thought was right. But never did I question the character of those with whom I disagreed. Never did I let pass an opportunity to join hands with someone just because he or she held different ideals.

In public service, I found a venue for my pursuit of a stronger America—by ensuring the safety and security of all Americans, by producing clean energy here at home instead of importing oil from abroad, and by honoring our brave men and women in uniform with the benefits they earned. I found a way to care for others. And in the past year, I have found a value that is unbreakable even by the most vicious of attacks.

The tragic January 8th shooting in Tucson took the lives of six beautiful Americans and wounded 13 others, me included. Not a day goes by that I don't feel grief for the lives lost and so many others torn apart. Christina-Taylor Green, Dorothy Morris, John Roll, Phyllis Schneck, Dorwan Stoddard, and Gabe Zimmerman embodied the best of America. Each in their own way, they committed their lives to serving their families, community and country, and they died performing a basic but important act of citizenship that's at the heart of our greatness as a nation. They will be remembered always by their country and by their Congress.

I don't remember much from that terrible day, but I have never forgotten my constituents, my colleagues, or the millions of Americans with whom I share great hopes for this nation. To all of them: Thank you for your prayers, your cards, your well wishes, and your support. And even as I have worked to regain my speech, thank you for your faith in my ability to be your voice.

The only way I ever served my district in Congress was by giving 100 percent. This past year, that's what I have given to my recovery. Thank you for your patience. From my first steps and first words after being shot to my current physical and speech therapy, I have given all of myself to being able to walk back onto the House floor this year to represent Arizona's 8th Congressional District. However, today I know that now is not the time. I have more work to do on my recovery before I can again serve in elected office.

This past year my colleagues and staff have worked to make sure my constituents were represented in Congress. But if I can't return, my district deserves to elect a U.S. Representative who can give 100 percent to the job now. For that reason, I am resigning from the U.S. House of Representatives effective at the end of today.

Amid all that was lost on January 8th, there was also hope and faith. This past year, it is what I have often clung to: Hope that our government can represent the best of a nation, not the worst. Faith that Americans working together—in their communities, in our Congress—can succeed without qualification. Hope and faith that even as we are set back by tragedy or profound disagreement, in the end we come together as Americans to set a course toward greatness.

Everyday, I am working hard. I will recover and will return, and we will work together again, for Arizona and for all Americans.

Sincerely,

GABRIELLE GIFFORDS,
Member of Congress.

□ 1110

HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

SENATOR MARK KIRK'S CONDITION

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the leadership for allowing me this time to come to the floor. I'm going to do two short items, and then I'll address the weekly discussion on high-level nuclear waste and Yucca Mountain.

First, because of this day and our focus on the sacrifice of our colleague GABBY GIFFORDS, let me update my colleagues on Senator MARK KIRK's progress, since he was a former colleague in this Chamber.

Senator KIRK's early prognosis is good, and his doctors are pleased with his progress at this point. As the Senator continues his recovery, his offices will remain open to constituents. I will just add very similarly, Congresswoman GIFFORDS' staff continued to do the best job they could to serve the constituents of her congressional district. While she was unable to attend to many events, staff really did pick up the ball and carry it for her, as Senator KIRK's staff will continue to do for the State of Illinois.

During MARK's five terms in the House of Representatives and his first in the Senate, Senator KIRK has worked tirelessly on behalf of his constituents. From traveling around the State holding town halls, to working with Members on both sides of the aisle to build consensus on key issues, to traveling overseas to advocate for strengthening America's security in relationships with foreign nations, Senator KIRK has demonstrated endless energy and dedication in public service. I have no doubt that he will return to the Senate with the same zeal and passion for his job that he had when he first entered this Chamber 12 years ago.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK COOK

Mr. SHIMKUS. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. It's an organization designed around legislators from all of our NATO countries. It's been in existence over 50 years. Since the legislative bodies in most chambers are the funding for the military, it's important that the legislative body talks about NATO's role in the past, in the present, and in the future.

During my time as a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I became great friends with a member of the British Parliament who recently passed away, and I would like to pay tribute to him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to my British friend and colleague, Frank Cook, who passed away on January 12. Frank was a longtime colleague of mine in the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. As you know, the Assembly brings together Members of Congress with their counterparts from Canada and Europe to talk about issues that concern us all. As a leading member of the Defense Security Committee, Frank Cook made vital contributions in debates in the Assembly from the mid-1980s to 2010 on issues as wide ranging as Afghanistan, arms control with Russia, NATO's operation in Kosova, and its relations with Ukraine and other partners. He also served as vice president of the Assembly.

Frank embodied the spirit of the transatlantic alliance. He was never shy to express his opinions with a clear mind and a sharp wit. Even when Frank and I disagreed on policy, we remained friends and allies because we shared the values that underpin NATO: freedom, democracy, fundamental human rights, and the rule of law. We both believed that the NATO Alliance was critical to our collective security and defense, and that we as legislators in our own countries needed to do everything we could to make sure it was capable of meeting the threats we face in the 21st century.

I can recall many unforgettable experiences I've shared with Frank. I observed him lead a forceful debate on controversial issues and get all sides mad, like a debate he led on Nagorno-Karabakh in Quebec in 2006.

He and I took incoming artillery fire from the Taliban in Kandahar Airfield in 2007.

During the summer of 2010, we visited Greenland together. We visited a military encampment called Point North, which is north of the Arctic Circle. The dogs there pull sleds and provide early warning for polar bears. They appear quite scary, but Frank was the first to amble up and pet them.

Frank was a throwback to a time when characters could be listed—and by being listed, in parliamentary speak, that means being put on the party list for election—so Frank was a throwback to a time when characters could be listed and serve constituencies.

But perhaps my most memorable experience was when Frank would regularly treat us with the best performance of ''My Way'' since Old Blue Eyes himself—not a small feat for a Brit.

I learned a great deal from him, and he will be deeply missed by many of his friends at the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and here in Congress.

Now to the business at hand, Mr. Speaker. Again, thank you for letting me come down once again to talk

about a very pressing and important issue in this country, one that I'm going to continue to use the bully pulpit for to help educate my colleagues, the public as a whole, even you, Mr. Speaker, on the need to address the issue of high-level nuclear waste in this country.

It's an issue that has been around since the development of the nuclear weapon system that we used to win World War II. Some of that waste is still there from that time, and it still sits in the same location of 40–50 years ago. It has hit the international stage with the experience that Japan has had in Fukushima Daiichi and the tsunami, not just the generating facilities themselves but what happened to the nuclear waste on-site, and an international nuclear disaster that still is making it difficult for our allies in Japan and really causes us to make sure that we look at our systems and understand what is our national policy on high-level nuclear waste and why we are not moving forward.

What I've done in my times coming to the floor is go around the country and highlight where nuclear waste sites are and compare it to where we, by Federal law, have stated our nuclear waste should be stored. This is all under the 1982 Energy Policy Act, and a site was located under that law in 1987. So let's go through the area for a brief review.

This is what happens when we no longer have pages on the House floor to help us.

The first site I visited personally was in Washington State and the site is called Hanford, which was a good place to start in this tour of where nuclear waste is because the vast majority of nuclear waste stored here is Department of Defense and Department of Energy waste that was used to develop our nuclear weapons systems during World War II.

There are 57 million gallons of nuclear waste on-site, mostly in large tanks of 750,000 to a million gallons each. The waste is stored 10 feet underground. The waste is 250 feet above the water table, and the waste is 1 mile from the Columbia River. And something that is not listed there, some of that waste is leaking from the tanks.

□ 1120

So let's compare it to the site that we have decided by law to establish, which is Yucca Mountain. Yucca Mountain has currently no nuclear waste on-site. The waste would be stored 1,000 feet underground. The waste is 1,000 feet above the water table, and the waste would be 100 miles from the Colorado River. Nuclear waste next to the Columbia River or nuclear waste stored underneath a mountain in a desert? That is site number one.

Next, not to pick on other States to the exclusion of mine, the next location I talked about was the Zion power plant, decommissioned, high-level nuclear waste still on-site. Let's compare it to Yucca Mountain. Sixty-five casks containing 1,135 metric tons of nuclear waste, the waste is stored above the ground, 5 feet above the water table and 1,300 feet from Lake Michigan. And, of course, this is Lake Michigan right there.

Part of the time what I've been doing is highlighting a location and then looking at the States surrounding. The State of Wisconsin has two nuclear power plants, both on Lake Michigan similarly located. Of course, the stats for Yucca Mountain are the same.

Let me add here that we have already spent $15 billion to study this site of Yucca Mountain, 20 years in the making; and we still wait.

I'm not sure if this is still in the proper order that I have come down to the floor, but the next nuclear power plant that I wanted to highlight was San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. Now, this one is in California, and it's right next to the Pacific Ocean on the opposite side from where Japan is. You can see the waves, and you can see how close it is to the Pacific Ocean. At this power plant, there are 2,300 waste rods on-site. The waste is stored above the ground and in pools, and it's adjacent to the Pacific Ocean, as I said, and 45 miles from San Diego.

Yucca is 90 miles to 100 miles from Las Vegas, and it's also located on government property the size of the State of Rhode Island. It's controlled by a couple of entities, the Department of Energy being one, the Bureau of Land Management being another, and the third one, it is a nuclear test site where we tested nuclear weapons years ago.

I didn't mention Zion nuclear power plant. Zion is located about 45 miles from Chicago, Illinois. There is another nuclear power plant, and that is located in Massachusetts. As you can see, it's next to Cape Cod, the Pilgrim generating facility. There are 2,918 spent fuel assemblies on-site. Waste is stored above the ground in pools. And why is that important? Part of the problem in Fukushima Daiichi was that there was waste stored in pools. Because of the disaster, we're not really sure what happened. Either the foundation was cracked and the coolant water left the pond, or the power went off, the water couldn't circulate, the heat by the rods evaporated the water, then the heat on heat caused the rods to, in essence, start to melt, which is a very dangerous situation.

So much of our nuclear waste throughout this country is stored in pools around the country. Why is that important? Because it's our national policy, based upon a law passed in 1982, followed up by the location site in '87, that we are to have one geological repository, not nuclear waste stored all over this country; but we would have one centralized location. Now, it's important to add that in the next couple of days, the Blue Ribbon Commission is going to come out with a report, and we think it's going to say that it's in the national interest to have one geological repository for high-level nuclear waste. And we await, with interest, that report.

Now we go to Idaho National Labs, a Federal national laboratory in Idaho. Comparing it to where nuclear waste would be stored if we would continue to comply with Federal law, we have in Idaho there 5,090 canisters of waste. A good point to note on this waste, a lot of this waste, again, is from the research done on nuclear power and nuclear weapons systems. And in that process, you create waste. In Hanford, as they're trying to decide what to do with the waste, the containment systems to transport the waste have all been designed with the plan to store in Yucca Mountain.

So when you look at the 53 million gallons in Hanford, and we're going to move that waste out of Washington State and into Yucca, time, effort, energy, and money has gone in to preparing the technology to move this waste and store it in Yucca Mountain, similar to Idaho National Labs. Currently, though, we have 5,090 canisters on-site, waste is stored above the ground, waste is 500 feet above the water table, and the waste is 50 miles from Yellowstone National Park.

Then we go to the great Southeast in the State of Georgia, and we look at the Savannah generating station where you have 6,300 canisters of nuclear waste on-site, water is stored right below the ground zero to 160 feet above the water table. And as you can see from the photo, it's right next to the Savannah River.

Part of the debate that the environmental left and anti-nuclear folks told us about is water in the desert and how it's going to affect nuclear waste. And part of the educational process that I've learned going through the different sites is you really can't find a nuclear power site—and, of course, all nuclear waste generated is still on-site—that's not close to a body of water. So that's this whole issue about would you rather have it next to a body of water or would you rather have it in a desert. I think that debating point is pretty clear. So that's Savannah generating station versus Yucca Mountain.

Right before the end of last year, I came down on the floor and the location that I was to talk about next—of course, I got off topic a little bit and didn't really clarify and identify—is Turkey Point. Turkey Point is in the State of Florida. And, of course, again, we're comparing it to Yucca Mountain. At Turkey Point, you have 1,074 metric-ton vehicles of spent fuel on-site. The waste is stored above the ground in pools. Waste is on the Biscayne Bay at sea level, and the waste is 10 miles from the Everglades versus Yucca Mountain.

Again, defined by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, Yucca was established by Federal law, by this Chamber and the other Chamber and the President of the United States in 1987.

Yucca Mountain is in a desert; the storage site would be underneath a mountain in that desert far away from any population that would be immediately affected.

Another location that I was to address last week, which I also got off topic, is the Sequoyah Nuclear Generating Station. Sequoyah is in Tennessee, but it's right on the South Carolina border. At Sequoyah, there are 1,094 metric-ton vehicles of spent fuel on-site. The waste is stored above ground in pools in dry casks, waste is 25 feet from the groundwater, and waste is 14 miles from Chattanooga on Chickamauga Lake.

What I've done once we get to new States that I haven't really identified is then I've gone and looked at the Senators' past statements and/or their voting record on this because we had a vote on the floor this year on whether we should move forward with the dollars to finish the final scientific study by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and that vote was 297 ''yes.''

□ 1130

Now, there's only 435 Members in this Chamber; a huge bipartisan vote that really sent a signal of where the will of this Chamber is.

So why can't we move forward? The issue is the majority leader of the Senate happens to be from the State of Nevada. And to really get the Senate to move, you have to hold the Senators from these States accountable, or at least for them to state a position as to where they stand on where the nuclear waste currently is, and really what is the proposal and what should we do with it.

So having done that before, I then look at the Senators from the State of Tennessee and the State of North Carolina. Senator ALEXANDER is a ''yes.'' Senator CORKER is a ''no.'' Senator BURR is a ''yes.'' A ''yes'' is let's move our nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain in a desert underneath a mountain.

Senator HAGAN is silent. What do I mean by ''silent''? We couldn't find any public statements. Of course, the Senate has not cast a vote. So we hope maybe the Senator will sometime make her position known, but as for now we will list her as being silent. Again, why is that important? Because we really need to find out where the Senators are.

Under the Senate rules, to break a filibuster you have to have 60 votes. So I'm hoping that through this process we will finally tally them up, which is what I'll do at the end of my time, and kind of show you where we are so far.

Now, I still have a couple of places around the country to address. Remember that these are just one—many States like mine. I've pointed out Zion, but we actually have six sites and 11 reactors. Illinois has a huge nuclear power plant. Fifty percent of our electricity comes from nuclear power. So even though I'm mentioning a few, you can multiply that by three, as far as how many nuclear power plants are out there. And equivalently, if there is a nuclear power plant in your State, then your State is the storage site for nuclear waste right now.

The State that I came to the floor on to highlight today and the region is the State of Arkansas and the State of Missouri. Now, Missouri, as I know—I'm from Illinois. I'm from southern Illinois. I know the State of Missouri well. The State of Missouri has a nuclear power plant called Callaway. So the same thing I'm mentioning here on this power plant in Arkansas you can make for the Callaway plant.

So let's look at the one we've chosen, which is a power plant called Nuclear One. Again, Nuclear One has 1,260 MTBs of spent fuel on site versus none at Yucca Mountain. Nuclear One has waste stored above the ground in pools and dry casts. Obviously, there's no nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain, but if there were, where would it be stored? It would be stored 1,000 feet underneath the ground.

Nuclear One has waste adjacent to a water supply. Of course, you can see the photo right here. As I've highlighted, in almost every nuclear power plant or waste site there's water nearby. Well, of course Yucca Mountain is in a desert, so the waste would be stored 1,000 feet above the water table. Nuclear One has waste on Lake Dardanelle, a reservoir on the Arkansas River.

Now, what's a reservoir? I think, by definition, a reservoir is a body of water that you've created to hold water for public use, whether that's for recreation or for drinking and stuff. So there you have, you've got Nuclear One right on this reservoir.

Now, what about the Senators from the State of Arkansas? I mean, are they happy with this nuclear waste on site? So let's look at their positions. We actually have a few other States represented, too.

First, from the State of Arkansas, we have Senator BOOZMAN, one of our former colleagues, has a stated position and cast votes in support of Yucca Mountain. Senator PRYOR, as far as we can tell, is silent. From Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY is a ''yes.'' Senator HARKIN is not only silent, he's a ''no.'' So not sure why that would be, maybe because Iowa doesn't have nuclear power plants in the State of Iowa, but there's definitely some around there. It must be his position that nuclear waste stored around this country is okay.

Then you go to the State of Kansas. Another colleague, former colleague, Senator MORAN, has voted ''yes'' on Yucca Mountain as a good place to put high-level nuclear waste in a single repository. Senator ROBERTS, also a ''yes'' vote. From the State of Missouri, another former colleague of ours, Senator BLUNT is a ''yes'' on moving high-level nuclear waste from the State of Missouri to a desert underneath a mountain. Senator MCCASKILL is silent on this, which, again, since I'm next door to the State of Missouri, I know that the Callaway nuclear power plant is in the State of Missouri, and Senator MCCASKILL is silent on that issue.

So what's our scorecard? Where are we at with going around the country? Because remember, Mr. Speaker, because of the Senate rules, we have to get to 60 to really push something through. So we've identified what we believe is actually 36 ''yes'' votes so far. We've identified actually 10. This should be updated. We have 10 that we really don't know their position; in other words, they have no public statement or they have not cast a vote. And then we have eight definite ''noes,'' which means they have made public statements in opposition to moving nuclear waste underneath a mountain in a desert or they've cast a vote somewhere in some type or signed a letter. We're happy to be corrected on any of this analysis of where Senators are, but I think it's time that we start to get some accountability in this process.

Why have we not moved forward on Yucca Mountain? And the answer is pretty clear that when this administration was running for the Presidency, he, wanting to get support from the senior Senator from the State of Nevada, promised not to move forward. That's fine. It was a political decision. He's holding to his commitment to do that at the cost of what? Nuclear waste being held across this country, in States around this country, in places that, after Fukushima Daiichi, you might argue might not be the best place to have this nuclear waste.

So the President and the Majority Leader of the Senate has placed this in the political realm. Elections have consequences. We're approaching an election cycle. There will be Senators on the ballot in November. What is their position on what their State, and what should be the national position on what we do with high-level nuclear waste.

So we do know we've got a lot who are on record saying nuclear waste ought to go in a single repository in a desert underneath a mountain. We do believe that the Blue Ribbon Commission this week will say this country needs a single repository.

We do have 10 Senators that we do not know their positions; and, to their credit, we have eight that we do know their position in opposition. But it looks, from being a casual observer, and if the trend continues, that we're getting close to a majority of U.S. Senators that say that we should have a single repository, and that single repository should be what's been identified under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the following legislation in 1987 that said Yucca Mountain is the site.

□ 1140

Why is this important? Fukushima Daiichi is example number one, the

health and wellness of our citizens, the location of all of this nuclear waste. We have to continue to highlight these concerns because the nuclear waste isn't going away. In fact, we have got some nuclear power plants being constructed right now. Maybe in 10 or 15 years, they will start generating. When they do, they will start creating nuclear waste, and that nuclear waste is going to have to go somewhere.

The question that we have highlighted throughout this year we'll finish in a couple of months. Should that be in all these States and all these locations, or should it be at a single repository?

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to coming down numerous times in the future to continue to identify each State, each Senator, and then allow the public access to the information so that they can make a decision if this is an important criteria in this next election cycle. I hope that the answer would be yes so that we would follow up on a national policy to deal with high-level nuclear waste.

We have only spent $15.5 billion in over 20 years to identify Yucca Mountain as a site. If we were to try to find a new site, we throw away the $15 billion, the 20 years of research, and we will have to have another 20-year time for research and development and another $15 billion to get to the same location we are today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

A FUTURE WHERE WE ARE IN CONTROL OF OUR OWN ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege and the honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and to follow the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) here in the well.

I want to first say that he makes clear sense with the argument he makes. We don't hear these arguments enough. Too often, this Congress is dealing with superfluous issues, political issues, rather than practical solutions.

It brings to mind for me the President's speech last night from in front of where you are right now, Mr. Speaker. Very early in his speech, the President said he wants to see a future where we are in control of our own energy. Part of that solution is encompassed by the delivery of JOHN SHIMKUS here a little bit ago with what to do with nuclear waste. I would say also there are other things we can do from a technical perspective to utilize that, recycle that.

Some of the nuclear waste is tied up because of an Executive order that was signed by President Jimmy Carter more than 30 years ago. We haven't cracked the code on how to resolve that even though the science has caught up.

We have a long ways to go, and we need to have an administration that actually means this: A future where we are in control of our own energy. The instant that I heard that statement last night, it occurred to me that the President is in control of our energy, but the American people are not in control of our own energy.

I would point out the Keystone XL pipeline as an example. I heard an instantaneous rumbling here on the floor of the House of Representatives when the statement was made that we were going to be in control of our own energy.

The President also said he wants to see an all-of-the-above energy policy. The all-of-the-above policy includes responsible utilization of all of the nuclear fuel that we have and then responsible positioning of it when we can no longer utilize the energy within it.

But it also includes drilling offshore, and it includes drilling the nonnational parks public lands in the United States, and it includes bringing in energy from other places on the North American continent from our friends, our number one trading partner, Canada, our good friends to the north.

They are in energy-export despair right now because they have listened to what the President had to say. For 3 years, the study has gone on about the Keystone XL pipeline, 1,666 miles of pipeline that runs from Canada down to the gulf coast. It allows for a spur to go off of that to a future refinery that I hope is built in southeastern South Dakota and which would be able to transfer refined oil that would come from the oil sands in northern Alberta and be able to distribute that across the country, primarily to points from there south and east.

Mr. Speaker, the President has blocked the Keystone XL pipeline. He announced last night that he is opening up 75 percent of the—I have forgotten the exact word he used—75 percent of the Federal lands that are eligible, I think would be a fair way to characterize his statement, to drilling for oil. That is news to all of us. It is news to the oil industry, I believe. In the previous State of the Union address that he gave, if I recall correctly, he mentioned that he has opened up drilling in the gulf coast again. In at least one of these addresses that he made, that's what he has said.

But when you look at the permits, it is a different story. They say they are opening up permits again after the BP spill; but we have lost a lot of deepwater rigs to other parts of the oil-developing world, including outside the Western Hemisphere. The industry tells me that once you lose a big rig from a location, it takes about 4½ years to transition it back into the gulf coast again. That has happened to rig after rig down off of the gulf coast.

The announcement that this is the most oil that we have produced or most petroleum that we have produced domestically in 8 years may be true. I don't know anyone else that knew those numbers in this Chamber either. And I am wondering how they defined it, how they quantified it.

In any case, we have a lot of oil that is being produced up in the Bakken region of North Dakota. The reason for that is because they found the oil up there. It is on private land. The Federal Government has not as many tools to obstruct the development of oil production in the Bakken region of North Dakota as they might have in 75 percent of the Federal property that the President addressed last night.

I don't know that any of us believe that he is serious about wanting to develop American energy, especially American petroleum energy. If he were serious about it, why would he not direct the Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton—whom he spoke kindly of last night—why would he not direct her to sign the agreement with Canada so that we could go ahead and build the Keystone XL pipeline? The only Federal procedural obstruction left in the way is the permit that is the agreement between Canada and the United States. All that is required to do is to drop that last section of pipe in place right there at the 49th parallel, at the border of the United States and Canada. The rest of that is all green light.

And so if it weren't for the fear that the billions that would be invested for a real return—not to mention the 100,000 jobs that would be created, if you look at the iterations that come forth from not just the construction of the pipeline but the operation of and the economic development that flows from it, 100,000 jobs. But his speech last night was about jobs, and we can't have the 20,000 jobs instantaneously lit up by the Keystone XL pipeline or the additional 80,000 jobs that flow from the economic development from the Keystone XL pipeline. Why? Not because there is a legitimate environmental concern. There is not one left. Not because, as the President said, he needs more time to study it. There has been 3 years to study it.

Think about how this works if you're the President of the United States. You're constantly barraged with decisions that must be made, and you have set up a network, a pyramid of advisors that filter that. You're only dealing with the most difficult problems that there are. Your subordinates take care of all the other decisions. No one—no matter how smart, no matter how quick—really has the mental space to deal with all of the things that go on here in the United States of America. It is humanly impossible. The President has a series of advisers. They advise him.

The President has said, I haven't had time to study the Keystone XL pipeline. The President of the United States is never going to have time to study all of the nuances that have to do with all of the components of the